

ing out on the latter from $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ their length. (I cannot give the exact distances, as the quills are in moult and not full grown.) Shafts of both white to near tips. The two central tail-feathers are not longer than the other tail-feathers.—N. S. Goss, *Topeka, Kan.*

Brachyrhamphus hypoleucus off the Coast of Southern California.—On a return trip from the Coronados Isles to San Diego, California, May 20, 1884, when about five miles out to sea, and a little north of the Mexican boundary line, I shot a pair of Zantus's Guillemots. I have the birds in my collection. Notes from 'Catalogue and Register,' entered from memoranda taken at the time of killing:—

Sex.	Length.	Alar extent.	Wing.	Tail.	Tarsus.	Bill.
♂	9.60	16.00	4.65		0.95	0.75
♀	10.10	16.35	4.75		0.95	0.80

Depth of bill at base, .23; width, .20; gape, ♂, 1.30, ♀, 1.40. Iris dark brown; bill black with sides of under mandible at base pale bluish; inside of legs, tops of feet and webs light blue; outside of legs, bottoms of feet and webs dusky; claws black; the testicles a little larger than swollen kernels of barley; no signs of the enlargement of any of the eggs in the ovary. On the way up I saw three others but was unable to approach near enough for a shot.

The birds closely resemble *B. marmoratus* in winter dress, and, like them, prefer to escape by diving and *flying* under the water, but when hard pressed more readily take wing. This I account for by their legs being longer, which enables them to spring at a bound clear of the water.—N. S. Goss, *Topeka, Kan.*

'Avifauna Columbiana'—a Protest.—Coues and Prentiss's late 'Avifauna Columbiana,'* while bearing the seal and token of its authorship in the clear and woodsy style of the notes, that so often give us bright glimpses of the life history of our birds, as well as in the arrangement of the scientific and technical matter, is yet disappointing in some regards, owing to the fact that the authors did not take pains enough to bring their work up to date, or to revise by recent observation the work of twenty-one years ago.

As it stands, the list is misleading in some of its statements, and does not thoroughly represent the recent progress of ornithology in the District of Columbia. In their preface the authors refer with justifiable pride to the first edition, prepared by them while yet in college, as standing "the test of time better than boys' work generally does." In their present edition "there has been found little to correct," "and not much to add, of the authors' own knowledge, because they have paid little attention to the subject during the intervening years. They have, however, *entirely recast*

* Avifauna Columbiana, by Drs. E. Coues and D. W. Prentiss, a revised edition of their 'List of the Birds of the District of Columbia,' published in the 'Smithsonian Report' for 1861.